REMARKS

In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 19-20, 30, 33-34, 36, and 39 under

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No.

2003/0093417 to Kagimasa et al. (hereinafter "KAGIMASA") in view of U.S. Patent No.

6,643,661 to Polizzi et al. (hereinafter "POLIZZI"); rejects claims 21-28 and 41 under 35 U.S.C.

§ 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over KAGIMASA and POLIZZI, further in view of

U.S. Patent No. 6,581,072 to Mathur et al. (hereinafter "MATHUR"); and rejects claim 35 under

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over KAGIMASA and POLIZZI, further in

view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0027666 to Beck et al. (hereinafter

"BECK"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. [1]

By way of this Amendment, Applicants propose amending claims 24, 30, and 36 to

improve form. No new matter has been added. Claims 19-28, 30, 33-36, 39, and 41 are pending.

Claims 19-20, 30, 33-34, 36, and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly

being unpatentable over KAGIMASA in view of POLIZZI. Applicants respectfully traverse this

rejection.

Independent claim 19 is directed to a method that includes permitting multiple users to

access, via a network, first news content contained in one or more news documents stored at a

document server, sending query data, in response to a portion of the first news content being

accessed by at least one of the multiple users, from the document server across at least a portion

of the network to a news server that is operable to crawl and aggregate news content from a

---

[1] As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicants' silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, reasons to modify a reference and/or to combine references, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to analyze and dispute such assertions/requirements in the future.

plurality of news sources, receiving second news content, via the network, at the document

server from the news server based on the query data, incorporating the second news content into

the one or more news documents, and permitting the multiple users to access, via the network,

the second news content at the document server, where the document server and the news server

comprise different network devices that are connected to the network. KAGIMASA and

POLIZZI, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this

combination of features.

For example, KAGIMASA and POLIZZI do not disclose or suggest sending query data,

in response to a portion of the first news content being accessed by at least one of multiple users,

from the document server across at least a portion of a network to a news server that is operable

to crawl and aggregate news content from a plurality of news sources, as recited in claim 19.

The Examiner relies on lines 2-6 of paragraph [0044], lines 9-11 of paragraph [0046], and lines

3-5 of paragraph [0057] of KAGIMASA for allegedly disclosing sending query data, in response

to a portion of first news content being accessed by at least one of multiple users, from a

document server across at least a portion of a network to a news server (final Office Action, p.

3). Applicants disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of KAGIMASA.

Paragraph [0044] of KAGIMASA discloses:

> In the document management system of this embodiment, designation of a query subject structure is added
> to a query expression in order to search a similar document and acquire related information of a registered
> document. This can be realized by utilizing the similar document search technique of searching a structured
> document similar to a seeds document, this technique being disclosed in JP-A-2001-14326.

This section of KAGIMASA discloses adding a query subject structure to a query expression in

order to search a document similar to a registered document and thus acquire information related

to the registered document. This section of KAGIMASA does not disclose or suggest sending

query data, in response to a portion of a first news content being accessed by at least one of the multiple users. This section of KAGIMASA does not disclose or suggest any news content. Furthermore, even if it is deemed reasonable that the registered document can be interpreted as news content, a point Applicants do not concede, this section of KAGIMASA does not disclose or suggest that sending a query expression to search a similar document to a registered document is done in response to at least one of multiple users accessing a portion of the registered document, as would be required by claim 19 based on the Examiner's interpretation of KAGIMASA. Therefore, this section of KAGIMASA does not disclose or suggest sending query data, in response to a portion of the first news content being accessed by at least one of multiple users, from the document server across at least a portion of a network to a news server that is operable to crawl and aggregate news content from a plurality of news sources, as recited in claim 19.

Paragraph [0046] of KAGIMASA discloses:

> The document registration program 110 operates to store the registration document file, properties and user profile entered from the client PC 20 by using the document registration/display program 210 into the document storage unit 410 of the document database 40. The user profile is attribute information for identifying the user, such as an organization to which the user belongs, a work under the charge of the user, a user mail address and the like. The document registration program 110 operates to generate query data in accordance with the registration document file, properties and user profile, to store the query data in the query data storage unit 420 of the document database 40, and to set seeds documents which are used as query expressions of searching a similar document in accordance with the registration document file, properties and user profile.

This section of KAGIMASA discloses a document registration program that stores a registration document file, properties, and a user profile. The user profile includes such information as the organization to which the user belongs, work under the charge of the user, the user's email address and the like. The document registration program generates query data in accordance with the registration document file, properties, and user profile, stores the query data in a query

data storage unit, and sets seeds documents which are used as query expressions to search for

documents that are similar to the document in the registration document file. This section of

KAGIMASA does not disclose or suggest sending query data, <u>in response to a portion of a first</u>

<u>news content being accessed by at least one of the multiple users</u>. In other words, the query

expression in this section of KAGIMASA is not sent in response to a user attempting to access

any of the documents in document database 40 of KAGIMASA. Therefore, this section of

KAGIMASA does not disclose or suggest sending query data, in response to a portion of the first

news content being accessed by at least one of multiple users, from the document server across at

least a portion of a network to a news server that is operable to crawl and aggregate news content

from a plurality of news sources, as recited in claim 19.

        Paragraph [0057] of KAGIMASA discloses:

> Next, in accordance with the registration document M file, document properties and user profile, the document registration program 110 sets the following three query expressions to seeds documents for the preparation of retrieving related or similar documents. First, the contents of the registration document M file are set to a seeds document which is used as a query expression 1. Next, the values "finance", "m [band] bank" and "DB proposal" respectively of the document properties of the registration document M are set to a seed document which is used as a query expression 2. Next, the values "finance 1G ePJ" and "financial marketing" respectively of the structures "organization" and "work under charge" of the user profile of the registrant m are set to a seeds document which is used as a query expression 3.

This section of KAGIMASA discloses an example of the seeds documents used for the

preparation of retrieving documents related to a particular registered document registered in the

document database disclosed by KAGIMASA. Query expression 1 consists of a seeds document

of the contents of the registration document file. Query expression 2 consists of a seeds

document containing the values "finance", "m[band]bank", and "DB proposal", which represent

the structure of business type, customer name, and document name, and are related to the

properties of the registered document. Query expression 3 consists of the seeds document

containing the values "finance 1G ePJ" and "financial marketing", which represent the structures

organization and work under charge, and are related to the user profile. This section of

KAGIMASA also does not disclose or suggest sending query data, in response to a portion of a

first news content being accessed by at least one of the multiple users. Rather, the query

expressions are executed automatically upon the registration of a document. Therefore, this

section of KAGIMASA does not disclose or suggest sending query data, in response to a portion

of the first news content being accessed by at least one of the multiple users, from the document

server across at least a portion of the network to a news server that is operable to crawl and

aggregate news content from a plurality of news sources, as recited in claim 19.

In conclusion, none of the sections of KAGIMASA relied on by the Examiner disclose or

suggest sending query data in response to a portion of a first news content being accessed by at

least one of the multiple users. In the method of KAGIMASA, the query expressions are sent to

the document database as a result of a user registering a document in the document database (see

paragraphs [0059-0061] of KAGIMASA), and not in response to a document in the document

database being accessed by a user.

Furthermore, the query expressions in KAGIMASA are not sent from a document server

across at least a portion of a network to a news server, as also recited in the above feature of

claim 19. Rather, the query expressions of KAGIMASA are only used to search document

database 40 of KAGIMASA, as shown in Fig. 1 of KAGIMASA. In rejecting claim 30, the

Examiner referred to paragraph [0011] of KAGIMASA as allegedly disclosing a document

management server storing a plurality of documents and terminals interconnected by a network

(final Office Action, p. 5). However, it is only the terminals through which a user accesses the

document management server that are interconnected by a network and connected to the server by the network. The submission of the query expressions is all performed within the document management server and document database 40 of KAGIMASA, and the query expressions are not sent across the network. Therefore, KAGIMASA does not disclose or suggest sending query data, in response to a portion of the first news content being accessed by at least one of the multiple users, from the document server across at least a portion of the network to a news server that is operable to crawl and aggregate news content from a plurality of news sources, as recited in claim 19.

Moreover, KAGIMASA and POLIZZI do not disclose or suggest incorporating second news content into one or more news documents, as also recited in claim 19. The Examiner relies on Fig. 7 and paragraph [0061] of KAGIMASA for allegedly disclosing this feature (final Office Action, p. 3). Applicants disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of KAGIMASA.

Paragraph [0061] of KAGIMASA discloses:

> In accordance with the retrieval results obtained by the related document retrieval program 130, the related information notification program 140 sorts the retrieval results in the higher order of similarity to the registered document (in this embodiment, the registered document is also listed), and creates a related information list (refer to FIG. 7 and the like) for each notice destination user, the list including items such as similarity, document ID and document name. The registration document properties and user profile along with an appended file "related information.htm" are transmitted to each user by a mail.

This section of KAGIMASA discloses that the retrieval results (of documents related to a registered document) are sorted in order of higher similarity to the registered document, and a related information list is created, the list including such items as similarity, document ID, and document name. The registration document properties, user profile, and the appended file of related information are transmitted to the user. The mail sent to the user is depicted in Fig. 6 of KAGIMASA. It appears that the Examiner is relying on the "related information.htm" file as allegedly corresponding to the second news content, as recited in claim 19. However, the

"related information.htm" file is not incorporated into the registered document, as would be required by claim 19 based on the Examiner's interpretation of claim 19. Rather, the "related information.htm" file is sent to the user as an attachment in an email. The "related information.htm" file does not become part of the registered document, and therefore cannot be said to be incorporated into the registered document. Therefore, this section of KAGIMASA cannot disclose or suggest incorporating second news content into one or more news documents, as recited in claim 19.

POLIZZI does not overcome the deficiencies of KAGIMASA set forth above with respect to claim 19.

With respect to the reasons for combining KAGIMASA and POLIZZI, the Examiner alleges (final Office Action, p. 4):

> It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the data processing art to modify Kagimasa's method of aggregating news content from multiple sources to incorporate Polizzi's method of crawling documents, thus enabling access to multiple computer systems to retrieve data and present them to an individual in a standardized and easy-to-learn format (column 1 lines 46-50, et seq.).

Applicants submit that the Examiner's allegation is merely a conclusory statement about an alleged benefit of the combination. Such conclusory statements have been repeatedly held to be insufficient for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In this respect, Applicants rely upon KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. _____ (April 30, 2007) (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)), where it was held that rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.

At the outset, contrary to the Examiner's allegation, KAGIMASA does not disclose a method of aggregating news content from multiple sources. Rather, KAGIMASA discloses a

method of registering a document in a document database and finding related documents within that same database. There are no multiple sources in KAGIMASA.

Furthermore, POLIZZI discloses a crawl server that indexes a number of news sites to update an information source. Since KAGIMASA is unconcerned with news sites, but is only interested in related documents in a document database, it is not clear how the method of POLIZZI could be used to improve the document database of KAGIMASA. If this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner explain how crawling news sites would improve finding related documents in a document database.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 19 is patentable over KAGIMASA and POLIZZI, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on KAGIMASA and POLIZZI be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 20 depends from claim 19. Therefore, this claim is patentable over KAGIMASA and POLIZZI for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on KAGIMASA and POLIZZI be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 30 is directed to a system that includes a first server configured to store a locally created document with news content that contains embedded search queries, and send a search query that was embedded within the news content across at least a portion of a network to a second server, in response to a user selecting the locally created document, and the second server being configured to crawl a corpus of news documents hosted at a plurality of remote servers to obtain news content, search the news content based on the

search query to obtain search results, and provide particular news content to the first server based on the search results, the first server being further configured to permit a plurality of users to access, from across the network, the locally created document with the news content and the particular news content received from the second server, where the first server, the second server, and the plurality of remote servers comprise different network devices that connect to the network. KAGIMASA and POLIZZI, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, KAGIMASA and POLIZZI do not disclose or suggest a first server configured to store a locally created document with news content that contains embedded search queries, as recited in amended claim 30. The Examiner relies on lines 1-2 of paragraph [0041] and lines 1-3 of paragraph [0046] of KAGIMASA for allegedly disclosing this feature (final Office Action, p. 4). Applicants disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of KAGIMASA.

Paragraph [0041] of KAGIMASA discloses:

> The document management server 10 has a document database 40, a document registration program 110 for controlling the document database 40, a registration management information reference program 120, a similar document retrieval program 130 and a related information notification program 140.

This section of KAGIMASA discloses various elements of a document management server. This section of KAGIMASA does not disclose or suggest anything that could be reasonably interpreted as a locally created document with news content that contains embedded search queries. Therefore, this section of KAGIMASA does not disclose or suggest a first server configured to store a locally created document with news content that <u>contains embedded search queries</u>, as recited in amended claim 30.

Paragraph [0046] of KAGIMASA was reproduced above. This section of KAGIMASA discloses a document registration program that stores a registration document file, properties, and

a user profile. The user profile includes such information as the organization to which the user belongs, work under the charge of the user, the user's email address and the like. The document registration program generates query data in accordance with the registration document file, properties, and user profile, stores the query data in a query data storage unit, and sets seeds documents which are used as query expressions to search for documents that are similar to the document in the registration document file. It is not clear on which elements of KAGIMASA the Examiner is relying on for allegedly corresponding to the embedded search queries, as recited in claim 30. Applicants submit that none of the query data, query expressions, or seeds documents can be reasonably interpreted as embedded search queries, because none of these are embedded within the registration document. Rather, the query expressions are used to create the seeds documents, which are used to locate documents that are related to the registered document. This process is preformed once in KAGIMASA, in response to a user registering a document, and the results are stored in a "related information.htm" file (paragraph [0061] of KAGIMASA). Therefore, neither the search expression nor the seeds documents are embedded within the registered document. Therefore, this section of KAGIMASA cannot disclose or suggest a first server configured to store a locally created document with news content that contains embedded search queries, as recited in amended claim 30.

Furthermore, KAGIMASA and POLIZZI disclose or suggest a first server configured to send a search query that was embedded within the news content across at least a portion of a network to a second server, in response to a user selecting the locally created document, as also recited in amended claim 30. This feature is similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, a feature recited above with respect to claim 19. Therefore, Applicants submit that KAGIMASA

and POLIZZI do not disclose or suggest this feature for at least reasons similar to the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 19.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 30 is patentable over KAGIMASA and POLIZZI, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on KAGIMASA and POLIZZI be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Independent claims 33 and 36 recite features similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, features recited above with respect to claim 30. Therefore, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over KAGIMASA and POLIZZI, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 30. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 33 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on KAGIMASA and POLIZZI be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 34 and 39 depend from claim 33. Therefore, these claims are patentable over KAGIMASA and POLIZZI for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 33. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 34 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on KAGIMASA and POLIZZI be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 21-28 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over KAGIMASA and POLIZZI, and further in view of MATHUR. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 21-28 depend from claim 19. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection, Applicants submit that MATHUR does not overcome the deficiencies of KAGIMASA and POLIZZI set forth above with respect to claim 19. Therefore, claims 21-28 are patentable over

KAGIMASA, POLIZZI, and MATHUR, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 21-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on KAGIMASA, POLIZZI, and MATHUR be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 41 depends from claim 33. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection, Applicants submit that MATHUR does not overcome the deficiencies of KAGIMASA and POLIZZI set forth above with respect to claim 33. Therefore, claim 41 is patentable over KAGIMASA, POLIZZI, and MATHUR, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on KAGIMASA, POLIZZI, and MATHUR be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 35 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over KAGIMASA and POLIZZI, and further in view of BECK. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 35 depends from claim 33. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection, Applicants submit that BECK does not overcome the deficiencies of KAGIMASA and POLIZZI set forth above with respect to claim 33. Therefore, claim 35 is patentable over KAGIMASA, POLIZZI, and BECK, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on KAGIMASA, POLIZZI, and BECK be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully request that this proposed amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered, placing the application in condition for allowance. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that entry of this proposed amendment would place the application in better form for appeal in the event that the application is not allowed. If the Examiner does not believe that all

pending claims are in condition for allowance, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned

attorney to expedite prosecution of this application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is

hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess

fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: /Viktor Simkovic, Reg. No. 56012/
     Viktor Simkovic
     Registration No. 56,012

Date: July 28, 2008

11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800 main
(571) 432-0899 direct
Customer Number: 44989